P.7.185-92.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

L.R 46-87.
M 185-65.

Later references.

1891-92.

192 .

(L.R)

File No. 200-91

Serial Nos. 1

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-22. 80

In ~~Part~~ B for October 1892

SUBJECT.

Claim of Doddo Ramanna and others for the Shanbhogi Office of Kempalapura in the Hunsur Taluk, Mysore District.

To,

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District.

L.R.

No. 5848 D. 24/29. 10. 1892.

P7.185-92

Requesting him to allow the Appellant to continue the duties of Shanbhogi Office under he was dismissed from the Office of Shanbhogi Ramanta for any serious offence.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Sanctioned

1.

Appeal Sommary

Appellant

Dida Daniel
of Cumpalaya
Kovvada Taluk
by his D Vadlamannati
advocate

Respondent

1. Vadlamannati
2 Ramamma

D 15—9—92

2.

4a

M. S. 105 of 1891

Appt
Dodda Ramanna
of Kampalapur
Honnendalli
Mysore

Respt
1 Venkatrao
Mirasi
2 Shamanna
under age, by R. 1

Appt & 1st Respt are R. Vgers and Shareholders of R. Village — For some time before 1889, R. 2nd Respt alone was doing duties on behalf of R. 1st, the Appt having gone to another Village & also work for their mirasi holding. In 1889, R. parties entered into an agreement each one year
to do R. work by turns & Appt did duties for R. 1889, 2nd Respt objected as it was Appts turn to do R. work. R. Amildar rejected the objection of Appt doing work by turns as inconvenient, that Appt was not trustworthy & that R. 2nd Respt might be allowed to do duties — R. Dy Comr passed an order on August 1891, that although the Appt is a

The Plaintiff was dismissed from her office of Chairlady of Umata on another ground on account of certain irregularities. The 2nd Accused alone signed the allowance to do duties of the office.

The appeal against her order

The Petition system was not yet introduced into the village.

The ground on which appellant was dismissed from her office of Chairlady of Umata and the strike are no where stated.

The Grievance that the 2nd Respt was no official status whatever. the 1st Respt stated at the hearing, that he does not want the 2nd Respt to do duties on his behalf & that he has no objection to the appellant doing duties

as ~~Brig~~ agreed in
1889.

~~and to pay the~~

~~expenses~~ Under these
circumstances, the
Dft Court is requested
allow the apht
to ~~depute to proceed~~
~~upon which he applt~~
~~was removed from his~~
~~office of Shanbhogie~~
~~Jurisdiction~~ to do
duties of the office
unless he was
removed from the
office of Shanbhogie
Jurisdiction for any
serious offence: If
he was dismissed
for any serious offence,
the same should be
reported for the further
orders of Govt.

It is Respt requested
that he might be allowed
to do duties till the
end of the Current year.
If the request cannot be
complied with ~~in~~ to the apht cause!

~~He applt~~ There is nothing serious against the Applt.
Bar of

be appointed, the
in Respt ~~Board~~ [illegible]
of the duties herein
~~of appointment~~ a
~~Licensee of the~~
~~Court~~.
but if he is not able
willing to do the duties
herein, then it will
be for the consideration
of the Dep Com^r whether
he (the Respt) shall
be allowed to nominate
his own Licensee, or
the Respt shall be
allowed to continue
to do the duties in his
behalf, the Respt undertaking
~~to~~ to do the duties herein

11/10/92

15/10

Approved 21st July 92
in pursuance of the
request made by the
Respondent

17/6/92

Approved 15th Sept 92
BD.
21/7/92

Sad
Dr is referred to
the Dep Com^r to know
what orders have been
passed

15/10

6.

32

Pleas

A petition of
Stephanie, widow of
the Majesty Stevens

Replication
Stevens Stanton
& Company.

Stevens petitioned the Court that
Peter Stevens & himself were brothers
Sons of the Peter, that in Company & Part-
nership with [illegible] they formed the Stevens-
& Peter on Upton, that in consequence they
entered into an agreement that each should
offer for 17 per diem, that the Defend-
this upon upon the Court, that in consequence
the petitioner in 1858, that in 1858
Peter Stevens held office and that the
the event you Petitioner he had the like &
held office, that [illegible] entitled to
part of the said and was entitled, that after
was not a voluntary [illegible] but entered
Voluntarily, that [illegible] Stevens
his Lord that the Stanley did not give
evidence [illegible] that the petitioner
found in Britain at Upton & Stevens &
and that Peter Stevens said that he
worked & came to the Port Upton &
the Respondent did not consent
which could entail on the Petitioner
One & hundred & five pounds
was at hand and [illegible] in
regard & have the [illegible] given
him either in favour of the Stanley
the Petitioner entered Stanley that [illegible]
[illegible] the Stanley
the part & evidence which was that
the said Peter formerly entered into
Copartnership & Stevens that each should
share alternately and accordingly, he
stated he did [illegible] & that
the Respondent [illegible] other
Stevens was in Court - the Petitioner
& that Peter Stevens was in the habit
of the Stanley [illegible] & Stevens

Pet^r No 1211 & 10/10/96.

Pet^r — Dodda Ramiah

In their order No 5848 & 24/10/92
P.C. 85-92

Govt. directed that pet^r should continue to do the Shanbogue duties of the Village of Kempadapur = The other Jukdar Venkatramiah attained ~~his~~ majority in 1896 & requested to be put in charge of the Office

The Dy Comm^r finally ordered that pet^r & Venkatramiah the two Jukdars should do duties by turns for a period of 3 years and that Venkatramiah should be put in charge of the office for a term of 3 years.

Pet^r appealed to Govt against this order: It was then directed that the Dy Comm^r's order should have effect & that the disposal of the appeal but the Dy Comm^r's order is that pet^r has been suspended for one year be another

Confirmed Case

The question for decision – leaving the temporary suspension which has not been appealed against – is how the Kankbogue work of Kempalapura is to be conducted.

Putta Setty has been introduced in the year 1889-90. The talik has (since) been settled

In the Dy Comr's order of 1891, it was stated that C-petr's (Venkatramaiah) family was in possession of the office at the time of the survey settlement

The Dy Comr's order of 1896 directing the kankdars to duty by turns seem to have been based on the Govt order of 1892, as otherwise it is opposed to the standing orders. But the Govt order of 1892 did nothing more than reject the claims of Kamanna back as far as Timmappa & C-petr and found that C-petr's claims to act on behalf of a coordinate kankdar were superior.

M 23/8/97

The Govt was requested
to report the circumstances
of the petr's dismissal
referred to in the Govt order
of 1892.

The Govt in reporting that
the record connected with the
particulars of the mutual are
not forthcoming & that the
proceedings in that case
appear to be very meagre,
also states that the petr &
C. Petr have agreed to
a compromise by which
each is to appoint one
two years & that the appointed
may be new ones instead
of the present
Appeal from the decision
that a period of 3 years
is not to be construed by Govt, it
has to be considered that
the whole case rendered
in this case & of the
a separate trial by reason of

x Under the Bombay rev law
the period of rotation should
not be less than 5 years
& not more than 10 years.
(Sec 38(6) of Bombay Act III
of 1874)

argt
because the system
was allowed!

18/4/98

Let this be noted
against the two
Commrs who
did not discuss
that the settlement
which is about
to be made under
present in force
regard under that
of Shareholders
not be accepted

28/4/98

29/4/98

Posted

29/4/98

Posted to 13th June 1898.

10/5/98

Com. Pollock see if we may
can be put on record
an amicable arrangement
Either the [illegible]
[illegible] If there are
[illegible] and expire Steps.
Then we [illegible]
10/5/98

13.6.98

The further information now called for is with a view to ascertain which of the Thamboys can claim ~~to be elder in point of enjoyment~~ to have enjoyed the best for a longer period & to decide the case on the analogy of the Sirkar & Sthala Thamboys in Kolar Dt. & Nadus & major Thamboys in the Malnad

The compromise now ~~sug~~ reported by the D/Commr is nothing less than a Sale of the office

25/8/95

16.

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 129 of 1896-97

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Dod Ramanna		(1) Venkatramanna (2) Shamanna

13th June 1898

Appeal to be done duly in appointed
(Not sitting in August for cases from Hon.)
Adjd to 5th September 98.

17.

Before the Government of Mysore.

Appeal No. 129 of 1896-97.

Appellant.	Respondents
Doddakamanna	(1) Venkatramanaiya (2) Thammanna.

Dispute regarding the Karabhinge office of Timpalapura in the Honnur Taluk.

List of papers in the file

(1) to (16) vide separate list attached

(17) Office note.

Posted to 5-th Sept^r

Sub^d to Pt-C^r

25/8/98.

95 Gy. whether sale of an hereditary office is an illegal act — Sec 23 Contract Act

Thammanna is a elected village patel, both their consent for transfer of the office is valid. Is transfer of office of village patel illegal — no Gy

26 8 98

(1)

Kl. Venkatramaya
28.9.91

Memorandum of appeal.

No. 1515

In the Court of the Commissioner

Appeal No. 115 of 1891-92

Name of Appeal Petition No. 1891

Appellant:— Kadira Ramaya, Kambagiri
& Venkatappa, Penugalatur
Cable, Hindupur Taluk

Respondents:— Venkatramayya, Son of
Thimmaka
2. Kambagiri Eramaka
Thimmana Cultivating
at the Venkatakaravillage
of the Same Taluk

The appellant above named begs
to appeal against the order of the Deputy
Commissioner of Anantapur dated 18th Aug. 1891
for the following reasons:—

1. That the Deputy Commissioner
misconstrued the nature of the appellant's
claim to the Kambagiri office.

2. That the appellant and the 1st

(Copy)

Respondent are Auckland as admitted by the Deputy Commissioner himself.

3. That the 1st Respondent was considered to be a minor and was found to be unable to do the duties connected with the Shanlopne office.

4. That the 2nd Respondent a foreigner has no right to continue to be in office against the wishes of the appellant

5. That the Deputy Commissioner erred in thinking that the appellant was dismissed while he was Shanlopne Pumaroa of saying also Phirka.

6. That the Deputy Commissioner erred in thinking that the so called misconduct had anything to do with the Shanlopne Auck in dispute.

7. That the appellant performed the duties of the Shanlopne office of the Phirka in dispute till 2nd Sept 1890, when the Auckland forcibly took over charge of the office and gave it to the 2nd Respondent who is a foreigner

8. That the appellant is able to perform the duties and is himself the Auckland

For these reasons the appt. prays that the order of the Dy Comr be cancelled and the appt be directed to perform the duties of the Shanlopne office of the village of Kenipa

Capoor

Ken Colore

28th Sept 93

21 Dis 170 K (2)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1518
dated 28 Sept 91 received at the
Dewan's Office from Doddaballapur
Kandaya & Venkatappa
Asuru Salutg

is forwarded, together with its one
enclosure, to the Dy. Comm.
Bangalore visit for Verification of Peons
& a precis thereof.

By Order,

for Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
7/11/1891.

7/11/91
16

Drafted as per
Cl 22 3. Amt Rs.

Dd.

Dis 170 K
Petition
16/11/91

Noted (3) 22.

8778

(General Serial No. 30).

P. 65

189/.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Bangalore

Dated 9th
Despatched 10th } December
Received

Enclosures No. The file of Vernacular Proceedings

General No. 758
No.

The official memorandum No. 1170, dated 7th instant, forwarding for submission a proceeding with the records & petition from Doddaramanna Thimmappa of Kampalapura.

The records called for in the above, together with the proceedings.

The petition and its enclosures are also submitted.

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

Compd. 10/12/91

Submitted to the Council

9/12

22/12/91

This is a regular Revn appeal

Call for by

first return 4th Feb

parties &

Revn Cases material

27/12

There is not wanted as there is an order on

27/12

No 28th April 1892

Adjourned to 16th April 1892 on per Counsel's order.

30/3/92

30/3/92

17-12-91

L.P. 200-9-14

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore. (4)

Appeal No. 95 of 1891.

Appellant.

Odda Ramiah of
Kamsalapur,
Nanjanagud Taluk,
Mysore District.

Respondents

1. Venkatasamma
minor.
2. Shamanna,
uncle of the 1st.

Decision, 23rd Feb. 92.

Appellant & 1st Respt are the
registered Shanbhogues of the village. For
some time before 1889 the 2nd Respt alone
was doing duties on behalf of the 1st, the
Appt having gone to live in the village
to do work for the minor herein. In 1889,
the parties entered into an agreement
to do the work by turns, each one year, and
Appt did duties accordingly that year.
In 1890, 2nd Respt claimed the office,
as it was his turn to do the work. The
Amildar reported that the system of
doing work by turns was inconvenient

that Capt. was not trustworthy, that the 2nd Capt. might be allowed to do duties. The Mag. issued an order in August 1884, that although the Capt. was Commandant, yet he having been dismissed from the office of Khandagiri promoted in another Circle on account of certain irregularities, the 2nd Capt. alone should be allowed to do duties of the office.

2. The appeal is against this order.

3. The Capt. system has not yet been introduced into the village.

4. The Govt. observe that the 2nd Capt. has no official status whatever. The 1st Capt. states at the hearing that he does not want the 2nd Capt. to do duties on this side, that he has no objection to Capt. doing the duties as agreed to in 1889.

5. Under these circumstances, the Mag. is requested to allow the Capt. to

to do duties of the office 25th inst. he was dismissed from the office of Shandagai pamacta for any serious offence. If he was dismissed for any serious offence the same should be reported for the further order of Govt.

6. The 2nd Pachpt requested that he might be allowed to do duties till the end of the current year. This request cannot be complied with if there is nothing serious against the Pachpt. But if the Pachpt cannot be appointed, the 1st Pachpt ~~is not bound to do the duties himself, but if he~~ is not willing to do the duties himself, then it will be for the consideration of the Govt whether he (1st Pachpt) should be allowed to nominate his own pamacta, or the 2nd Pachpt should be allowed to continue to do duties on his behalf, till the Sarvarakar undertakes to do the duties himself.

24/10/92

29/10/92

By Order

Draft

Asst. Secy.

Chief Secretary.

No 5848 26

Pet. A 185-91

Lt. [illegible] in one sheet,

with the rec. papers rec'd with his No 705 of

9th Dec. 91.

By Cde.

Lt. Chief Secretary.

A.S. No. 185

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
Oct 1892.

Endorsement granted to Lakshmi Ammani & Venkatasivam, Simon Casie, Mysore City, in reply to his Petition Registered No. 185 dated 23rd Sept 92.

Petitioner is ~~informed that~~ referred to the rules to which orders have been issued.

2. The enclosure is herewith returned.

"By Order,"

Re-draft.

for Chief Secretary.

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.

Sent issued with enclosure 29/10/92

Encl[x]

Govt.- see no
reason to reverse
the decision already
given in the matter

BO
4
18/92

Draft be submitted
to Council for
approval

4

(General Serial No. 32.)

1892.

No. 952

Name of Petitioner. Samanna

Village. Kempapura

Taluk. Hunsur

District. Mysore

Date of Arzi. 23/9/92

Date of Receipt. 15/10/92

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures.

ABSTRACT.

Petitioner is the first
Respondent in the Revenue
Appeal No. 105 of 1891-92.
During the trial of the case,
Petitioner was told that as
the 2nd Respondent wished
to appoint the Appellant,
and as he did not fear the
protest of the 2nd Respondent,
he (Petr.) raised have no
objection to give up the
post. Petitioner states

Mysore Govt. Central Press Bangalore—7-9-92,—1000.

in his defence,—

(1) that he has been doing the work most satisfactorily,

(2) that, though the 2nd Respondent is the Bara-adar, Petitioner has a claim to the post, inasmuch as the two Respondents are members of an undivided family,

(3) that he is falsely stated not to have paid the fotgi to the 2nd Respondent, and

(4) that the 2nd Respondent is yet incompetent, and the Appellant is pronounced unfit to do work by the Deputy Commissioner.

Petitioner prays that he may be allowed to continue in the present post, till the 2nd Respondent becomes competent.

S.V.

14/10/92

Bangalore cutcha
92-93
Appeal 952-1

952 R
15-10-92

To
The Councillors to His Highness the
Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore.

Appeal No 185 of 1891-92
Revenue.

Appellant
~~Doddaraiah~~

Respondents
(1) Lamanna
(2) Venkatramanna

I the 1st Respondent Lamanna most humbly beg to bring the following facts into your kind consideration:—

(1) Appellant's father & my father were both claimants to the Shanbogue ship of Kempapura

(2) after my father's death, the post was registered in my brother's name and on the death of the latter, it was registered in the name 2nd Respondent my deceased brother's son. This of course done with my wish as I was a better post at the time (1875) and as the 2nd Respondent was only 4 years old at the time I was appointed a Sumasta & ever since I have been doing the duties & I & the 2nd respondent and I are members of undivided family.

(3) The appellant lost his father in 1883 & the post was registered in the 2nd name, he, on the 2d

of a pirmacha, was doing the duties of the Kanbaque of Sathyagala. I was in consequence virtually appointed to do the duties of the Kamplepas Kanbaqueship.

(4) The applicant and Samian committed some grave irregularities in the discharge of his duties at Sathyagala & was consequently removed from that post. He then applied for permission to do the duties of the Kamplepas-Kanbaqueship & was advised that he could not do so as he was once found unfit owing to his misconduct. (vide my Commr's order (1043 of 1/12/50) & that I cannot allow him in the office.

(5) The present appeal against the Commr's order and in the trial before your Honor I am told that as the 2nd respondent wishes to appoint the appellant & as I did not pay the postage to the 2nd respondent, I cannot have no objection to give him the post.

I beg to submit:-

(1) that I have been doing the work most satisfactorily ever since I was appointed,

(2) that the 2nd respondent is a reputed office holder, I have a claim to the post in as much as he & I are members of the undivided family.

(3) That the statement that I failed to give the portage due to him, is false & was made at the instigation of the applicant. I have paid the portage and in fact credited half the portage towards the advances due from the 2nd respondent.

(4) That the 2nd respondent is very incompetent and the applicant has been pronounced unfit by the Government to do work, as the latter has found guilty of misconduct in the discharge of Government duties.

I therefore beg that all these facts may be kindly considered and regard may be had to para 5 of rule 4 of the Land Revenue Rules in which it is distinctly laid down that a pensioner not appointed if found ~~Competent~~ should not be dismissed merely because the incapacitated holds expectancy & preference for the appointment of another.

If it is the main objection that I did not pay the portage to the 2nd Respn. which in fact I have paid & do not object to pay in future, the Government is at liberty to make arrangements for the same being disbursed to the 2nd respondent from the Treasury direct.

In conclusion, I humbly beg that the case may be kindly con-

sidered, according to its merits and I may be allowed to continue in the present post till the 2nd respondent is found competent to assume charge of the post.

I beg to remain
most respected sirs,
your most obedient servant

23-9-92

No. 952-

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT,
29 November 1892.

Endorsement granted to Shivanna, Kamplapura, Hunsur Taluk, Mysore District.
in reply to his Petition Registered No. 952 dated 23rd cable ja

---

Petitioner is informed that Government see no reason to reconsider the decision already given in the matter.

"By Order,"

for Chief Secretary.

Draft

S.V.

96

Mysore Govt. Central Press, Bangalore.—5-7-92—1000.

35. (9)

1895

Reference. X

Stn 29/10

D.E. & Progs of Oct. 1895 etc. put up.

B/A 29/10

(1) Stamp sufficient
(2) Copy of order produced.
(3) Appeal in time

Council Case.

Refs. put up.

Appellant now repudiates the agreement referred to in Govt. decision of 15.10.92. and prays for a fresh decision

Submitted for order with Remarks & Statement received 2/11/96

No. 1211 of S. 129/96-97

Name of Petitioner Dodya Linganna - Basappa

Village Kamalapura - Begapalli taluk.

Taluk Kanakapura

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 10 - 10 - 96

Date of Receipt 17 - 10 - 96

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 3

ABSTRACT.

Appellant's petition dated 10-10-96 against Bangalore District's of 21-9-96 and 30-9-96 respecting the Mandagi of Kasaba Kamalapura. Appellant's petition and Order. Mandagi originally decided by Govt. on 15-10-92 that appellant pays Rs. 200 per annum and appellant's claim to the Mandagi free of rent. Mandagi has been held by appellant's family for 4 generations. Mandagi originally held by appellant's father Basappa. Mandagi was resumed by Govt. in 1892 and granted to Dodya Linganna. Mandagi has been held by appellant's family for 4 generations.

Gölle die Papiere über die Appellant und die Papiere über die Tabelle geschrieben wurden -

Herauf die Appellat über den Inhalt Contending die Tabelle und die Papiere der Appellat Blatt zu Blatt -

Die Papiere ist die Tabelle Schemata Regard Tabelle Papiere über Tabelle - die Tabelle Appellat Tabelle Schemata Tabelle Tabelle Tabelle

The recognizance given in this case by
which the said will have to enter
into the first. Now the above
entitled cause coming on for
hearing and the Court after
[illegible] the
argument of counsel
and the Court being
fully advised in the premises
finds that the defendant
has failed to appear
and that the
recognizance
entered into
by the defendant
and his
sureties
should be
forfeited
and judgment
entered
thereon
for the
amount
thereof
and
costs
of suit
and
that
execution
issue
therefor
and
that
the
said
sureties
be
discharged
from
further
liability
on
the
same
and
it
is
so
ordered
by
the
Court
and
the
Clerk
is
directed
to
enter
the
same
of
record
in
the
Journal
of
the
Proceedings
of
the
Court
and
the
same
was
done
in
open
Court
on
this
day
of
[illegible]
and
is
recorded
in
the
Journal
of
the
Proceedings
of
the
Court
for
the
said
day
and
year
and
the
same

to last for two years and to facilitate
post. work.

The petitioners further state that
the authorities are framing plans
to lead new sewage effluent
treatment - and hope that this
sewage effluent not to disturb the
hope for pending disposal of
this appeal.

Respectfully that such steps
may be fixed that crowds clear
of the sewage plant factory are
-cover and to facilitate post
work.

The petitioners further state that the sewage
Mining Comm. in the ~~Corporation~~ Municipality
the legality to subject to s. 92 of 332 published
in page 75 of the Gujarat Government of
October 1975 and also to the Municipality
passed the following resolution published
published in page 214 and 215 of the
Gujarat Rajpatra.

WK
28/1

RD
24/10

11/10/76

Ad.3
1211
Two Rupees stamp affixed

1211
17/10/76

ಪ್ರತಿಜ್ಞಾ ಪತ್ರ

ನಾನು ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಆದ ನಾನು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಪ್ರತಿಜ್ಞೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಘೋಷಿಸುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಭಾರತದ ಸಂವಿಧಾನಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಜವಾದ ಶ್ರದ್ಧೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಿಷ್ಠೆಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವೆನು ಎಂದು

ಉತ್ತರವನ್ನು - ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಂಜೆ ಬರುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ
ಹೊರಟರು ಸಿಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಅದೇ ಕ್ಷಣ - ಮಾರನೆಯ ದಿನ ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ
ಅವರಿಬ್ಬರೂ ಹೊರಟು ಬಂದರು - ಕೊಂಡಪಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಟ್ಟಿದರು
ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ - ಅಷ್ಟು - ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಹೊರಟರು - ಬಂದು
ಸಂಜೆಯಾಗುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಪಲ್ಲಿ - ಇವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದ
ಸುದ್ದಿ ಕೇಳಿದ ಕೂಡಲೆ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಪಲ್ಲಿಯ ಪ್ರಮುಖರು - ಇವರನ್ನು
ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸಿ ಕರೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗಿ - ಒಂದು ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಳಿಸಿದರು - ಅವರ
ಸೇವೆಗಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಿದರು - ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ
ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿದರು - ಸಂಜೆಯಾಗುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ - ಇವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ
ಸಂಬಳದವನು ಬಂದ - ಅವನಿಗೆ ಲಂಚ - ಲಂಚವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಕಳಿಸಿದರು
ಇವರು ಬಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅವನಿಂದ ಮರೆಮಾಚಿದರು ——

ಈ ವಿಧವಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು
ಮಾಡಿ ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ ಹೊರಟರು
ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಹೊರಟು ಮಲ್ಲಾರಪಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದರು - ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ
ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರು - ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದ
ಸುದ್ದಿಯನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ——

ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಹೊರಟವರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಉಳಿದು
ಇವರು ಬಂದಿರುವ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ - ಅವರು
ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಹೊರಟು ಬಂದರು - ಮಲ್ಲಾರಪಲ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರಿಗೆ
ಬೇಕಾದ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿದರು ——

ಶಾಲಿವಾಹನ ಶಕ ೧೭೩೦ - ಪ್ಲವನಾಮ ಸಂವತ್ಸರ
ಫಾಲ್ಗುಣ ಶುದ್ಧ ತದಿಗೆ

ಕೆಲವು ಸಲ ಹೀಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಂದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಜನ ಸೇರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಹೊಸಬರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದ ಪರಿಚಯ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಕೆಲವು ಸಲ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದ ಪರಿಚಯ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಆ ಸ್ಥಳದ ಪರಿಚಯ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥವರು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿರುವ ಜನ

ಯಾಂ ಇತಿಹಾಸಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲ್ಲ - ಮೈತ್ರ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ
ಸ್ಥಳಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಲ್ಲ - ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳನ್ನು
ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಷನ್ - ಗಂ - ಸ್ಥಳಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಲ್ಲ ಮೈತ್ರ ಸಾ
ಕ್ಷಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿದೆ

ಯಾಂ ಸಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ - ಯಾಂ ಸಂಬಂಧ - ಮೈತ್ರಿಸಾ
ಕ್ಷಿಗಳು ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕವಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ
ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾಗಿದೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ - ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ
ರವಲ್ಲ - ಆದರೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಲ್ಲಿ - ಯಾಂ ಸಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ
ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಸಾ

Register and submit with reference (59) B.L.

L.D. (10)

1896

No. 1392

Name of Petitioner A.S.A. Ramanadh Shanbhag

Village Kandlalur / Periapatna Hobli

Taluk Mysore.

District Mysore.

Date of Arzi 31-10-96

Date of Receipt 2-11-96

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil.

Submitted to Head Sheristedar

2/11/96

Submitted with the previous Petn No 1211

4/11/96

3/11/96

Render in 105 & Mr. Gallewed the appellant continue both men are said to be related & Shanbhag Has Appeal been into dated 7 & hearing been ordered when the above order was passed. Call upon a detailed report from the Dy Com & pend final decision of the Petn

5/11/96

ABSTRACT.

Reminder to his previous referred petition dt 31-10-96 (against the Sheristedar's order dt 21-10-96) submitting that the Sheristedar is enjoined to expedite proceedings and dispose him of his case speedily.

The ruling authorities have given him a strict order that the petitioner a man who is well acquainted with the duties of Shanbhag should have over the charge to another man & Venkatalaxmamma who is illiterate, and the petitioner is thereby feeling greatly distressed.

The petitioner begs that the Court may kindly consider his case and pass orders & grant that petitioner should not be compelled to hand over charge of the duty to the other man till the final decision of this appeal petition and further prays that he may be granted an order to the effect also.

B.L.

(11)

7-11-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition .

Registered No. 1214 of 96 dated 10-10-96 and 5-11-96 received at the Dewan's Office from Dorai Rau alias Bhadhraya of Kanjalapura, the Zabti attaching ... the ... of ... Jura

is forwarded, together with its enclosure, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District, for ~~disposal~~ a detailed report.

(2) It is observed that the ... in R.C. No 5 of 1891 ... the ... enclosure is to be ... and that ... X Appe ... directed to be ... Bhadhraya ... ~~[illegible]~~ ... ~~[illegible]~~

(4) It is ~~[illegible]~~ requested that ... decision ... Amen is ... in ... of ...

(5) The ... are requested ... ~~[illegible]~~ ... Report.

By order,

Secretary.

BANGALORE,

8th Nov. 1896

3 Information is required as to when the Potgi was introduced

References

Subst.

16/12/96.

Subst.

21/12

Remarks

Send a reminder to the Commr. for Inland Revenue for report. The Res. Commr. has already passed an interim order

21/12/96

Proceedings

Drawn up

23.12.96

(12)

1896

No. 1753

Name of Petitioner [illegible]

Village [illegible]

Taluk [illegible]

District [illegible]

Date of Arzi 1 – 12 – 96

Date of Receipt 5 – 12 – 96

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

in A.S.No. 605.

ಸಂಪಾದಕರಿಗೆ ಪತ್ರ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಕಳೆದ ಕೆಲವು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷರತಾ ಆಂದೋಲನ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಸಾಕ್ಷರತೆಯ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರೇತರ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಒಟ್ಟಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಈ ಆಂದೋಲನದಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಲ್ಗೊಳ್ಳುವ ಸ್ವಯಂಸೇವಕರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕ್ಷರತಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರ್ತರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ತರಬೇತಿ ನೀಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ತರಬೇತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶದ ಕೊರತೆ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದೇನೆಂದರೆ, ಕಲಿಯುವವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಮೂಡಿಸುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಲಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಸಾಕ್ಷರತಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರ್ತರಿಗೆ ಕಲಿಸುವ ವಿಧಾನಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತರಬೇತಿ ನೀಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕಲಿಯುವವರಿಗೆ ಕಲಿಕೆಯ ಮಹತ್ವವನ್ನು ಮನವರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ತರಬೇತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಕಲಿಯುವವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಲಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಸಕ್ತಿ ಮೂಡಿಸಲು ಕಾರ್ಯಕರ್ತರು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ

ಸಾಲಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಸಾಲಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ

(15)

189

1193
Pol 97.

From

The Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

Dated 4th
Despatched } August 1897
Received

General No. 176
No.

Enclosure No. Two petitions with its 3 Enc. and receipt

Petition
8/8/97

52

No. 176
Enclosure No. Two petitions with 3 M. Records.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE,
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore August 1889.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
Revenue and General Departments.

SIR,

With reference to your official Memorandum No. 1357-72 dated 7th November 1876, forwarding for report the petition of Doddasetiah Shanbogue of Kumpalapura, Hunsur Taluk &c praying the Shanbogi of that Village may be given to him to state as follows:—

2. The petitioner and one Venkatramanna which are joint Sharanyas Shanbogues of Kumpalapura prior to 1832, the petitioner had one Shamannah junior to him viz Venkatramanaiah, who was a minor, were doing duty by turns. In that year it was decided by the then Deputy Commissioner that the petitioner should not be allowed to do duty in Kumpalapura as he was dismissed from the office of Shanbogi Sumasta in the Satyagal Circle, in which he was also employed, on account of some irregularities, and that the Sumasta of the minor Venkatramanaiah should alone continue in office.

3. On appeal to Government Sumasta

Jamnadas Dhanjee, was ordered to be removed as he was a stranger, and the petitioner was directed to do duty by turns as agreed to by Ten Retramia which unless the former was dismissed from the Shanbague Sonnetaship of the other finka for some serious offence, the particulars of which were to be reported for the further orders of Government. The petitioner continued to do duty as Shanbague singly under the above order of Government but the remuneration was divided equally between himself and the Minor Inferior Ten Retramiah. In March, 1876, Ten Retramiah applied for permission to enter upon his duties himself as he had passed Minority, and the 1st Assistant Commissioner ordered that the petitioner and Ten Retramiah should do the duty jointly or by turns in accordance with their previous agreement. Against this order the petitioner appealed to this office, representing that Ten Retramiah was not literate and consequently unable to take upon the duties independently, that a promotion on his behalf was not to be allowed under the Government order of 1871, and praying that both may be made to work jointly.

in the village divided into 2 parts, with the map and the accounts made separate. After some correspondence my predecessor approved of the order passed by the Assistant Commissioner modifying it to the extent of giving each of the two Kulkarni a term of 30 years instead of one, as frequent changes of officiators would be prejudicial to Government interests (vide order No 655 dated 21st September 1896)

4. Against this, the petitioners appealed to Government, and as per orders in the memo under reference the petitioner has been allowed to continue in charge of the office during previous to the receipt of this order in September 1896, the Assistant Commissioner in charge of the talooka had passed an order suspending the petitioner for one year for misconduct for having drawn and credited towards the arrears of Kuldaya Sun due by himself the portion amount due to the Ryot remainder. The petitioner having also subsequently absented himself without giving over charge of his office as directed, and caused hindrance to work, the matter was reported to this office, and it was observed by my predecessor that the

S&B

the Assistant Commissioner order suspending petitioner being a matter unconnected with that in appeal before Government there was nothing to prevent effect being given to it. But the petitioner in this appeal to Government has not referred to the above order of suspension altho' he had pressing to Kheda from the date R to give over charge.

5. The payment of Bottgi was introduced in the year 1885-86, and the said Bottgi has been paid from the year 1889-90.

6. The petition, received with the memo under reply, and the Vernacular Correspondence connected therewith are submitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner
Nyapur District

Compd.
Ulu.

16-4-98

RZ 185-92 relating to the subject is put up.

AK
16/4/98

Submitted with reference to the 2nd in Council's order dated (illegible)

16/4/98

Put up to the Commissioner

Recd

18/4/98

RDyer
16.4.98

1897–98.

1644

Pet 555

From

The Deputy Commissioner

Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 9
Despatched } April 1898
Received

Enclosures No. Petitions Regs 12 & 1392 + record –

General No. 1173

Reporting on the petition of Doddia Ramiah regarding the Shanubhog of Hampapura village in the Hunsur Taluk.

Petitioner
15/4

Seen.
(illegible)
16/4/98

63

No. 173

Enclosures No. 2 petitions + record.

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 5th April 1898

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

Adverting to Your docket no: 2369 / P.F. 185-92 dated 28th August 1897, calling for a further report on the petition of Doda Ramiya &c: regarding the Shanbhogi of Kanyakanahalli village in the Hunsur Taluk, I have the honor to State that the petitioner and his opponent Venkatramanaiya have since come to an amicable Settlement and given Statements before the amildar agreeing to perform the duties of the office in question by rotation each for two years and to divide the annual Shotigi allowance equally between themselves.

2. Venkatramanaiah pleads inability to discharge the duties of Shanbhog and prays that his paternal uncle Shamanna may be appointed in his place on condition of relinquishing the land in favour of his family if he (Venkatramanaiah) should hereafter be blessed with any competent male

hale issue and they claim the same.

3. Ramanna and the petitioner having consented to this arrangement the same has been approved and the petitioner's appeal to Government may be considered to have been withdrawn by him.

4 With regard to the observation contained in para 5 of Government's decision in appeal no: 105 of 1871, I beg to state that the petitioner seems to have been removed from his office of Shanbhog (Jamasta) to another pirka (Sirgeal) for having entered a wrong name in a Revenue Patta, but the original correspondence in the Subject is not forthcoming nor does the offence appear to be so serious as to interfere with the petitioner's continuance in his present office.

5 The remainder proceedings connected with the case as per accompanying Serishta are submitted for reference and obliging return when no longer required.

6. The petition of Dodda Ramiah

and

and its enclosures are herewith re-
turned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

W. M. Mathewson
Offg Deputy Commissioner
Mylone District

Comps Watts

1898 — 99

Pet 61

Suted with the file.
The case stands adjd to 5th Sept,
together with Govt Memorandum appeal
regarding damages.
4/9/98

Draft-Docket-Sated as per Journal
orders of the Asst Secretary.
5/9/98

From

The Deputy Commissioner,

Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 1st
Despatched } August 1898
Received

Enclosures No. 1.

General No. 2,157.

Reporting the relinquishment of Lakkaa Ramaiya's right to ½ share in the Shanbogi of Kamalapura village in Jaya of Kamalapura Shanamma for a consideration of Rs. 700, etc.

Read
13/8

Govt 7444 99-4-98 from the Govt
Govt 555 07 185 of 92 in the Govt
Growth.

13/8/98

67

No. 157

Enclosures No. 2

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated 9th August 1893.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

In continuation of this office
letter No. 155, dated 9th August 1893
forwarding agreement on the
petition of Timma Nayaka, regard-
ing the Shanabag of Kempalapura
Village in the Nanjangud Taluq, I have
the honor to forward herewith the
Nanjangud Cutcherry Record Papers,
Rural Circle Notice and the ac-
counts from which it will be ob-
served that the petitioner has
since hit the consent of his brother
Puttaswamaya and of his son Rama
Swamaya relinquished Shanbag
6 1/2 share in the Shanabag in
question in favor of Kempalapura
Shamanna for a consideration

of Co. you must find to pay for the
[illegible] of the [illegible]
of the [illegible].

2. [illegible] of the remaining 2 shall be
to office [illegible] regard to
[illegible] the said [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] by the [illegible]
of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

3. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] will,
[illegible] [illegible], how the effect of
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
arrangement which is [illegible]
all the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[

Cour le 69 février 1861

Chambre des Députés

Pour recevoir ces documents

Député Commissaire

Pour copie conforme

From

To

The Deputy Commr
Myme District.

Dated 15th

Despatched 16th

Received aug 18 98

General No. 1272.

P. No. 1895 92.

(135)

Enclosure No.

His letter No 135 dated 9th August 1895 Reporting the encroachments ~~made by~~ ~~Chinese~~ ~~into~~ ~~Burma~~ of Shans and Shanmans residing in the Shanthogi of Kamphapum in the Mawun Taluk.

— w —

With reference to the above has the honour to request that the Dy Commr will be so good as to forward to this office extracts from all the available Shanthogi Registers relating to the Villages in question and to report on the following points:

21

(1) What are the particulars of the Imam Lands attached to the Shambhoji of in question?

(2) How were they treated at the Fakka Fotiji settlement?

(3) Who have been enjoying them?

2. The x returns are returned for reference and resubmission before the 5th Nov. by which date the original [illegible] lands be enjoined.

Draft-

for Secretary.

x read with letter 173 of 9-9-4 VI

Sec
15/8/98

+ [illegible]
16-8-98

17 72.



1893—94.

From The Superintendent

Mysore District.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Dated 3?
Despatched } September 1898
Received

Enclosures No.

General No. 241

Submitting further information regarding the exchange of ... Kanakapura ...

Petition
7/9/98

Read
7/9

No. 241

Enclosures No. Record extract & separate parcel

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commr
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore 5th September 1895.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

According to your docket No. 1272 - Pol. M. 185-92 dated 15th August 1895, calling for further information and references regarding the Shanbhogi of Kamplapur in the Hunsur Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith the Hunsur Amildar's report No. 132 dated 28th ultimo with extracts from the available Shanbhogi Registers of 1863-64, 1864-65 and 1885-86 as also an extract from the Pakka Paiki Register of the Taluk.

2. No Inam lands have been assigned for the Shanbhogi in question, but the Officiators were remunerated by each payment as shown in the accompanying extracts.

3. The Amildar states that it is not clear from the Register of 1885-86 how Dodramia son of Sitaramia acquired the share of Puttabhiramiah son Ramia who is shown as one of the Amildars in the Register of 1864-65. The correspondence referred to by the Amildar in his report, viz: a file of papers ending with his Ittilla No. 40 dated

2nd July 1805 - to the address of the Revd Isaac Hammick
Queen Square, Bloomsbury Dale. London, as desired.
The enclosed, Sent at the same time to the Saint
4. The words Submitted with pen underlined under
which are herewith resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obed. servant,

[illegible]

Revd Isaac Hammick
Queen Square

318 R

31 8 98

Bestätigt 31. 8. 98 mlg

12-9-98

By Order

For Secy

By Order

For Secy.

Pet
#185-98/12 8/10.9.98

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Dy Commnd, Dindigul for information with reference to his letter No. 241 Dt 3.9.98.

By Order

For Secy

Off
Date: 8/9.

(215)

12-9-98

Repe quick
22/9/98

1211 of 98 Pf 185 of 92-93.

Of 188 of 92 relating
to the Petr's Case is
setup

AN
22/9/98

Sir, The letter dtd 21.9.98
referred to by Petr is no 518 on
file. (Sno 17)

mdl
23/9/98 Std to 2nd counsellor
Petn no 518 was stated
the abstract of the proceedings
Land the " The abstract also
prepared & state that the respondents
have write the petn Hence return
filed from Hon'ble Looking Clerk
with the petn Doddavenamma
(appellant) Seems to have signed the petn
But the petn written on
law paper & with numerous
errors illegible & typos by
Stating that it is a petn "
from the two plaintiffs
But the petn was received on
31/8/98 & the hearing was on 5/9/98
The mistake
is where applied the
Bond & subscribed
Bond & subscribed
for another
18/10/98

28
19

189 8

No. 691

Name of Petitioner Doddavenamma

Village ~~Kyatanahalu~~ Peresapatna

Taluk Hunsur

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 19-9-98

Date of Receipt 21-9-98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure 4

ABSTRACT

With reference to Govt: Such
No: 1211 of 8-9-98 informing the petitioner that his
appeal has been dismissed
on the ground that he
has failed to appear before
Govt: on the date to which
the hearing of his case was
posted, the petitioner states
that he had submitted an
application under a registered
cover on 29-8-98, requesting
that his case may be post-

to some other date as he was going to undertake through newspapers that plague was prevailing in Bombay and as he was returning from field just then -

The petitioner therefore prays that he may be pardoned & that his appeal may be taken on file and the date of hearing intimated to him.

21/9/98

Encls:

1. Govt: Endt: no: 1211 dd 26.9.98.
2. Petn with Reasons &c: Commr Endt no: 77 dd 2.10.96
3. Copy of Rep: Commr Yadi dd 21.9.96
4. — do — of Govt: decision in Appeal no: 105 of 1891:

691
691A
21-9-58

By hand
Eighth annual plenary session
21 9 58 morning

ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಭಿನ್ನತೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ
ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.
ಹೀಗಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೂಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

Before me

13/4/97

once a year, that the said order that
the appellant should hold office for 3 years and
this not appearing with respect he asked the
appellant's consent to both working after the
office finish which the latter accordingly did
and the former order to work by himself was
set aside. Such being the case it was
not proper that appellant should, to ask the
Rekdar & have him put under the Shanbhag
who wants to work directly & without
the said in being appointed the former
factor and the Rekdar touched.
Search was accordingly made for 3 days
but no person need be found. In
the mean while orders were issued again
& have the chopdar given over & the latter kept that
this order be cancelled and the manual
enforced. From information it was found
that there were two Shanbhags & Kamdars
and that both were working
together. He therefore ordered the Rekdar with
all former orders as regards factors &
records was pending and said orders were
to be issued later on.

The Shanbhag appeal & the same effect
as above stated in their petition but in
addition the appellant says that in
consideration of payment of works in
addition & his profits Shamanna is
justified in asking for separate chopdar
for as he has not paid yet the same
could not be handed over yet. That appellant
was ready & have the chopdar given over
and petitioner also to next day -
The Respt contended & pray the writ
may issue & the said order may be
set aside

The said respondent the Rekdar kept the
case in abeyance for some days & then
asked for the account - yet & the
other name. The accts were made
up & the same being to hand over
the Rekdar after some difficulty in the
reported on 16.10.90 that Appellant
agreed had handed over charge
Shamanna. In an order
dated Shamanna before

18.

Appello n. 28/85 presso
la Suprema Corte
di Cassazione

12/2/88

Gen. 31

1897

From

The Secretary to Govt
Genl and Rev depts

To

The Deputy Commr
Hyderabad Dn.

Dated 28th

Despatched

Received Augt/97.

General No. 2367
P. F. No. 185-92

(351)

Encl. No. Appeal Memo —

The Deputy Commrs letter
No. 146 dated 4-8-97, re-
porting on the petition of
Dodda Ramiah of Hunsur
Shanbhag, regarding the
Shanbhogi of Kampala
-pura village in the
Hunsur Taluk —

With reference to the
above, I have the honor to
observe that the infor-
mation called for in para
5 of Govt decision in Appeal
No. 10 of 1891 forwarded
to you by Comr with his
office No. 5848 dated
P. F. 185:92 —
24-10-92 —, regarding the

circumstances

6/-

circumstances of the dismissal of the petitioner is not forthcoming in the report and to request that a further report may be submitted in the matter

2. The records and the petition with enclosures are returned for reference and resubmission

By order

C2

for Secretary

27/8/27

Note

LR 20--91

1898

No. 518

Name of Petitioner Shanmuga

Village Kamplapura

Taluk Hosur

District Mysore

Date of Arzi 27—8—98

Date of Receipt 31—8—98

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

File: no 2 when is regd

appellant has not

applied for adjournment

Ug 8/9/98

ABSTRACT

Rev: Appeal No: 129 of 1896-97

The petitioners state that they

have been served with a no

directing them

to appear before Govt: on 5-9

in connection with the above

appeal; that they are afrai

to come to Bangalore as they

are given to understand that

there is Plague in Bangalore

that Venkatramanaiya & Ou

Ramanna who are the joint

Surandars for the Shan Plag

of the Klapur have depos

before the Collector

effect

all his claims for the Shambhoge
in favour of the latter; that
this fact has been reported
to the Distt authorities & to Govt:
that as soon as Shanmuga is
made the sole Karnavar, a
certain amount deposited in
the Govt: Savings Bank at Hunsur
may be ordered to be paid to
Doda Kumara as compensation
and the same intimated to
the petitioners by means of an
endt:- that in the event of this
appeal not being disposed of (on 5-9-98)
on the ground that the clients
have not appeared before Govt:
in accordance with the notice,
the case may be adjourned to
some other day and the date intimated
to the petitioners and that they have
united in an amicable settlement
represented by them on 13-6-98.
Beg that their prayer may be
granted and the result
intimated to them by means
of an Endorsement.

CR
3/7/98

2 drafts

(21)

Proc of the Govt of Mysore

dd 2-00-91-21

Appellt
Doddaramanna
Capt

vs Respdts
(1) Venkatramanna
(2) Shamanna
Capt

x Ret to respective Govt

Read
(1) Petition of appeal no 129 of 1896-97 presented by Doddaramanna of the Village of Kamplapura, Huntur taluk, against the order of the Govt Commr, Mysore dt directing that the Shanbogs duties of the said Village be performed by the appellant & the 1st respt by rotation every 3 years
(2) Correspondence ending with letter no 241 dt 3/9/98 from the Dy Commr Mysore dt
(3) Records of the case

Read also Decision of Govt dt 15/1/1900

asst-pr appve
Govt dt 1st Connaught
dy 23/2/99

10710

25 2 99

expense & am cert
dy 24/2/98

In appeal No 115 of
1891-92

Order thereon No. 6050. dt 28.2.92. P.
P.P. 185-92 28

The parties agree to the
Darawand being made on
the name of 2nd respt
Shamanna & to his perform
the duties & enjoying the profits
& Mr approve of this arrange-
ment which avoids the evils
incidental to a system of
Appointment by rotation

letter omit art

2. A copy of the Razinama
filed by the parties will be
forwarded to the Dy Comr
for his information

Sent
23/2/92
Dy Comr Mysore
Sent to the parties